



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,608	11/12/2003	Jorn Maeritz	10808/111	5868
48581	7590	07/13/2005	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE			WALLING, MEAGAN S	
INFINEON				
PO BOX 10395			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60610			2863	

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/706,608		MAERITZ, JORN	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Meagan S. Walling		2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 June 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Whitefield et al. (US 6,512,985).

Regarding claim 1, Whitefield et al. teaches performing an analysis using values of at least one process parameter of a manufacturing process of a plurality of physical objects (column 1, lines 27-30); determining that at least one physical object of the plurality of physical objects does not satisfy a prescribed selection criterion (column 1, lines 45-49); marking the at least one physical object in such a way that the at least one marked physical object must be sent for a special measurement (column 1, lines 62-64); and removing the at least one marked physical object from the manufacturing process (column 1, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 2, Whitefield et al. teaches that the physical object is a wafer (column 1, line 21).

Regarding claim 3, Whitefield et al. teaches that the analysis is a statistical analysis (column 1, lines 39-40).

Regarding claim 4, Whitefield et al. teaches that the values of the at least one process parameter are measured when the plurality of physical objects is being manufactured (column 1, lines 11-13).

Regarding claim 5, Whitefield et al. teaches sending the at least one marked physical object for a special measurement (column 1, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 6, Whitefield et al. teaches that the special measurement is a measurement for checking the quality of the at least one marked physical object (column 1, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 7, Whitefield et al. teaches continuing the manufacturing process for any of the plurality of physical objects not marked as failing the prescribed selection criterion (see Ref. 22).

Regarding claim 8, Whitefield et al. teaches that the selection criterion is a quality characteristic of the manufacturing process (column 1, lines 16-20).

Regarding claim 9, Whitefield et al. teaches that the selection criterion is not satisfied if a value of the at least one process parameter goes above or below a prescribed limit value (column 1, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 10, Whitefield et al. teaches performing an analysis using values of at least one process parameter of the manufacturing process of the plurality of physical objects (column 1, lines 27-30); marking at least one physical object when, as a result of the analysis, the at least one physical object does not satisfy a prescribed selection criterion (column 1, lines 62-64); removing the at least one marked physical object from the manufacturing process (column

Art Unit: 2863

1, lines 64-66); and sending the at least one marked physical object for special treatments (column 1, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 11, Whitefield et al. teaches performing analysis using values of at least one process parameter of the manufacturing process of the plurality of physical objects (column 1, lines 27-30); marking at least one physical object when, as a result of the analysis, the at least one physical object does not satisfy a prescribed selection criterion (column 1, lines 62-64); removing the at least one marked physical object from the manufacturing process (column 1, lines 64-66); and sending the at least one marked physical object for special treatments (column 1, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 12, Whitefield et al. teaches performing analysis using values of at least one process parameter of the manufacturing process of the plurality of physical objects (column 1, lines 27-30); marking at least one physical object when, as a result of the analysis, the at least one physical object does not satisfy a prescribed selection criterion (column 1, lines 62-64); removing the at least one marked physical object from the manufacturing process (column 1, lines 64-66); and sending the at least one marked physical object for special treatments (column 1, lines 64-66).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 13-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Art Unit: 2863

The primary reason for the indication of allowability of claims 13-16 is the inclusion of the limitation of preventing values associated with the at least one marked physical object from affecting an average product quality of the plurality of physical objects. It is this limitation in the claimed combination that has not been found, taught, or suggested by the prior art that makes these claims allowable.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meagan S. Walling whose telephone number is (571) 272-2283. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached on (571) 272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

msw


John Barlow
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800